

Remarks

Applicant and the undersigned would like to thank the Examiner for his efforts in the examination of this application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as not containing features recited in Claims 26, 31, and 44.

These claims have been canceled from the case, rendering this objection moot.

II. Rejection of Claims 24-44 under 35 USC 112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 24-44 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 24 and 43 have both been amended to address the Examiner's concerns by incorporating the elements of Claims 26-28 and 30-36 thereinto.

Claims 27 and 30 have been canceled.

Claims 32-36 have been canceled. Claim 37 has been amended to comport with the amendment to Claim 24 in which the key has been recited as a "workpiece" and thus is not a positive limitation. As the key-restricting device is intended to represent a patentable feature, Applicant believes that it is not necessary to positively recite the key.

Claims 39 and 41 have been amended to clarify that the "track" and "slider", respectively, do indeed refer to the claims from which Claims 39 and 41 depend, namely, Claims 38 and 40, respectively.

III. Rejection of Claims 24, 25, 29, and 38-43 over 35 USC 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 24, 25, 29, and 38-43 over 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by both Gledhill (US 6,442,899) and FR 2370845.

The rejection of Claims 24 and 43, as amended to incorporate the recitations of now-cancelled Claims 26-28 and 30-36, is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has stated that Gledhill '899 teaches a key stop means, and refers to numeral 65, and also that Gledhill teaches a device that is "releasable using a key".

However, Gledhill does not teach or suggest an element that serves as a key rotation stop; the element 65 of Gledhill is a circular aperture and thus cannot stop the "simple tool" from rotation.

The present invention, on the other hand, includes an element for stopping the rotation of a specially shaped key, in the element of the support plate aperture and a protrusion extending beyond the distal end of the key that cooperate to prevent the key from turning beyond a predetermined angle..

Similarly, FR '845 does not teach or suggest an element that serves as a key rotation stop. Referring to FIGS. 2 and 3 of FR '845, which are split cross-sections, it appears that C-shaped channels are provided; however, as can be seen in FIG. 1, the forms 20 are received in circular recesses. Note that in FIG. 3, for example, the forms 20, indicated partially in shadow, are already turned to a 90 degree orientation. Thus there is no feature to prevent a rotation of the key beyond a predetermined angle, as recited in Claims 24 and 43 of the present case.

Therefore, it is respectfully believed that Claims 24 and 43, and Claims 25, 29, and 38-42 dependent therefrom, patentably define over the cited art.

IV. Rejection of Claim 37 under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claim 37 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gledhill '899 or FR '085.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. As neither Gledhill '899 and FR '085 teaches a specially shaped aperture for use as a key-stop means, a V-shaped notch cannot be considered obvious thereover, and the Examiner's assertion that "it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the different portions of the key hole of '899 or '085 with a V-shaped notch to receive a key of corresponding shape, or of whatever form or shape was desired or expedient" is respectfully traversed. The apertures of Gledhill '899 and FR '085 are dimensioned so as to admit a key, and there is no teaching to stop the motion of said key in either of these documents.

Therefore, Claim 37 is respectfully believed to patentable define over the cited art.

V. New Claim 45

New Claim 45 has been added to more particularly point out that which Applicant regards as his invention.

In particular, Claim 45 includes the recitations of Claim 24, and further includes the key as a positively recited element.

Therefore, as Claim 24 is believed to be patentable over the cited art, Claim 45 is likewise believed patentable over the cited art.

Conclusions

Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments place this application in a condition for allowance, and passage to issue is respectfully solicited. Applicant and the undersigned would like to again thank the Examiner for his efforts in the examination of this application and for reconsideration of the claims as amended in light of the arguments presented. If the further prosecution of the application can be facilitated through telephone interview between the Examiner and the undersigned, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Jacqueline E. Hartt, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 37,845

ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST, P.A.

255 South Orange Avenue, Suite 1401

P.O. Box 3791

Orlando, Florida 32802

(407) 841-2330

Agent for Applicant